

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 6, 2012

AGENDA

CASES

1. **Bridge Street District – MKSK Scioto River Corridor Urban Design Framework**
(Presentation and Discussion) **Planning Presentation**
2. **Community Plan 2012 Amendment**
12-046ADM **Administrative Request**
(Presentation and Discussion)
3. **Riverside Planned Commerce District North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter**
12-073Z/PDP/FDP **Perimeter Drive**
(Approved 7 – 0) **Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**
(Approved 7 – 0) **Final Development Plan**
4. **Tartan Ridge, Section 5-1** **9327 Burnett Lane**
12-080FDP/FP **Final Development Plan**
(Approved 7 – 0 – Final Development Plan) **Final Plat**
(Approved 7 – 0 – Final Plat)

Chair Chris Amorose Groomes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, Warren Fishman, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, and Joe Budde. City representatives were Jennifer Readler, Steve Langworthy, Claudia Husak, Gary Gunderman, Rachel Ray, Justin Goodwin, Aaron Stanford, Kristin Yorko, Alan Perkins, Terry Foegler, Jonathan Lee, Jordan Fromm, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the documents into the record as presented. Ms. Kramb seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the November 1, 2012 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, abstain; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 – 1.)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the November 8, 2012 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Fishman seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, abstain; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 0 – 1.)

Communications

Ms. Husak said they would like to have some time at the end of the meeting to go over electronic documents.

Administrative Business

Ms. Amorose Grooms said the two cases listed on the published agenda had consented to the conditions. She asked if anyone other than Mr. Hardt wished to pull case 3 for questions or discussion from the consent items.

Ms. Amorose Grooms announced the order of the cases. [The meeting minutes reflect the published agenda case order.]

Ms. Amorose Grooms briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

1. Bridge Street District – MKSK Scioto River Corridor Urban Design Framework

Planning Presentation

Ms. Amorose Grooms introduced this Bridge Street District presentation as an introduction to the City project to create a strategy to guide the design, development and prioritization of the key public infrastructure projects within the Scioto River Corridor, create a refined vision and implementation strategy for the development of a public riverfront park, and create an urban design framework to guide key private development opportunities within the study area.

Terry Foegler introduced this presentation and said he appreciated the opportunity to speak the Commission on this effort. He said most of the Commissioners were at the joint session with City Council to discuss the rationale behind the initiative. He said this is a kick off with the Commission with the notion that when they engage in the joint session with City Council in mid January, 2013, they will have a series of concepts and ideas to begin to bounce off of them and get feedback. He said they shared with them the range of the project that are being proposed throughout the Bridge Street Corridor with a wide range and diverse and geographically dispersed pattern of projects being proposed.

Mr. Foegler said they have engaged a team lead by MKSK and Chris Hermann will be giving details on the members. He said they would like to get some consideration from the Commission and to begin to think about the roundabout at Riverside and SR161 and if there are properties redeveloped on either side of the roundabout and how to encourage redevelopment. He said they talked about pedestrian connections to the roundabout and the design team has begun to look at those and they need to think through all the objectives and how this pedestrian movement is going to take place. He said they need to consider the character where there might be a more of the river in design and character and landscape materials ought to be something that makes it clear to be entering the river corridor. There is a lot of discussion to the nature and character of the green space or park on the east side of the river as Riverside Drive gets relocated. The notion of a pedestrian crossing point had been looked at extensively and the design team has reminded them of what it connects, where they land and the activities that placed around them, what they visually experience are all critically important, they are thinking what are the different kinds of landing points and kind of activities especially given some of the challenges of providing surface parking on the east side of the river. Mr. Foegler said they have also started to look at the east side of the river at some of the proposed developments.

Mr. Foegler said this is all about taking the work that has been done thus far at a larger, broader scale and begin to look at a much more focused way so that they produce from this a document that will provide an urban design frame work that can help establish the character and nature that will guide both public and private investment decisions going forward.

Chris Hermann, Associate Principle at MKSK, said the private developers are stepping up and have interest in this area. The idea is that there are places where there need to be public/private partnerships. He said the details matter and they need to get to a level of detail and understanding to make it all work. The City of Dublin has asked them to come on board to help with that process and look at the investments that need to be made, the order, the priorities, help get it exactly laid out and how those

things help unlock the right kind of development and get the developers into the right mind set of what they all want to see for the Bridge Street Corridor, that responds to what Dublin expects. He said the first projects out of the gate in 2013 are going to set the stage for the community and what is the bar, what is going to be done and what is Dublin doing, this will set the stage and get it right and the developers will know what the expectations are and positively spiral from there.

Mr. Hermann summarized some of the questions the project team has been contemplating for the urban design framework regarding parking in the Historic District and the connection between the two sides of the river.

Mr. Foegler said if there are elements of things that the Commission would like to make sure they have thought about make sure to share those with the Team or at the Joint Meeting.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there has been a date determined in January. Ms. Husak said it looks like it will be a scheduled meeting night for the Commission on January 17th, there are three Council Members that have confirmed for that date. Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is out on that date.

Mr. Taylor said he had been taking notes while they were talking and he could not begin to talk about this because they will be here all night and everything said is what he has been waiting to hear for four years, especially the part where they are finally going to be getting some design input. He said they are ready to start seeing some solutions and not just talk about the "what ifs" and wants to make sure that they are not allowing this to be designed by committee, they need a couple of strong design personalities to put their stamp on this and make it their own, so that it has consistent character. He said that the Commission produced a definitive paper about all of the things they thought were priorities four years ago. He said one of which was hierarchy to this stuff, so that the library, park, municipal space, green space isn't all equal and need be a scale.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they are all very excited and they have put a lot of blood sweat and tears into the project and are looking forward to something tangible.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this project. [There were none.]

2. Community Plan 2012 Amendment 12-046ADM

Administrative Request

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this administrative request for review of draft amendments to the 2007 Community Plan as part of the 2012 Community Plan Amendment process.

Mr. Goodwin apologized for not being able to provide revised content in advance of this meeting. He said he not expect any detailed feedback but wanted to provide an overview of the revisions to the Bridge Street Plan and the future land use map.

Mr. Goodwin said they have removed the specific colors shown on the Bridge Street District Plan and are using a neutral brown color across all of the blocks to address the Commissions' concern of the reading too closely as land uses on the map. He said the overall Bridge Street District Plan graphic is the same with the same street network, conceptual open space and green way connections. He stated the big change noted is a series of different colors for the design points, which were previously orange. Mr. Goodwin said the design points are classed into different categories or topics to help people understand which design points deals with a specific topic. He said the blue is a specific design detail recommendations, the yellow symbols represent development opportunity areas, orange is used for general or miscellaneous items, purple is used for mobility, and green is used for open space and green way connections. He said the blue square is used to represent locations of conceptual illustrations that Goody Clancy developed and were included in the Vision Report.

Mr. Goodwin said the character boundaries were added in black and the different colored designations of different development areas were eliminated. He said the Scioto River overlay is shown in yellow. He said if you click anywhere in the District on the map and it will pop up the name of the district and you will be able to zoom directly to that District. He said they have also added the text from the Vision Report for each the character districts.

Mr. Goodwin asked the Commission go onto the site and look at the plan and click on the design points they have added images to the text. He said they have images of how architecture may frame a roundabout, the Greenville Liberty bridge as an example of an iconic pedestrian bridge, and additional images from Greenville as they have been inspiration of much of this project. He said they included projects throughout Columbus and some existing conditions within the area. He said this is a work in progress and do not consider any of the specific images or design points to be final. Mr. Goodwin said he would welcome any feedback or additional images that better represent the design points.

Mr. Goodwin said there were concerns identified internally of how to depict potential parks and open space areas on the Future Land Use Map (FLU Map), particularly with regards to private properties. He said the FLU Map shows primarily parks and open spaces areas in the western portion of the planning area that have yet to develop. He said the map shows the stream corridor areas, potential open space nodes that would be linked to the stream corridors, a greenway along the potential alignment for Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extending up north of SR 161, and large wood lots depicted as parks and open space. Mr. Goodwin stated while it is appropriate to target areas for future open space preservation, it is problematic to show as a land use designation called Parks and Open Space on the future land use map when the areas are private property. He said he is working on including an overlay that shows these areas with a park land use designation, but also allowing them to show a specific base land use.

Mr. Goodwin asked if the Commission had any comments on the Bridge Street Plan and if the Commission thought they were moving in the right direction with how to graphically depict the plan. Mr. Hardt said he agreed the Area Plan is moving in the right direction. He said understood the problematic nature of how green spaces area depicted and said the proposed overlay is a good solution.

Mr. Goodwin said moving forward he will continue to work through December into January to get to a final version and will be scheduling a public meeting to show the website in a real-time environment. He said the goal is to bring everything back to the Commission for a full review and recommendation to City Council and in February.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they would be voting of digital media and didn't know if they have ever done that. Mr. Goodwin agreed and talk to our legal department about how to move into an ordinance, as there will be a few pieces of the project that will need to be in a hard format, such as the Future Land Use Map and the Thoroughfare Plan.

Ms. Newell asked if anyone that is color blind attempt to use the website and if they were able to recognize the different colors distinctions. Mr. Goodwin said they are working with the website editor and making sure that this website is an accessible as it can be and there are various things they can do and they will have that discussion with them and with GIS editor and thanked her for bringing it up.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked Mr. Goodwin for his hard and tedious work on this project.

3. Riverside Planned Commerce District North, Subarea A3 – The Perimeter

12-073Z/PDP/FDP

**Perimeter Drive
Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

Final Development Plan

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan/Final Development Plan which is a request to develop a vacant 2.9-acre site with an approximately 14,800-square-foot retail building, including restaurant spaces and associated patios, in Subarea A3 of the Riverside Planned Commerce District North, located on the north side of Perimeter Drive, between the intersections with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Hospital Drive. She said this application will require two votes, the rezoning with preliminary development plan will be forwarded to City Council for final approval and the Commission is the final authority on the final development plan. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case, including the applicant, Paul Ghidotti with the Daimler Group.

Ms. Husak said this site is on the north side of Perimeter Drive and is a 2.9 acre parcel that is currently vacant. She described the site and adjacent developments. She said the proposal is for a commercial building that could accommodate restaurant spaces on either end and has some in-line tenant spaces that could accommodate a variety of uses as outlined in the development text. She said on either end are patio spaces proposed for the building, there is a large plaza area to the north which could accommodate additional seating if warranted depending on the uses in the spaces and parking centered to the north, east and west. She said as proposed the plan meets parking requirements of 97 spaces and provided is 125. She said the applicant is proposing administrative approval for additional patio spaces as long as furniture and any other amenities complement one another and are of typical high quality design that is seen within the City.

Husak said there are sidewalks on all sides of the building that also connect to the south sidewalk along Perimeter Drive. The applicant has the option for shared parking with Champaign Bank and they are asking the applicant to do a more formal agreement. She said architecturally it is very similar to what was presented at the informal review with more traditional styling and elements, a lot of detailing on all sides of the building. She said they asked the applicant to break up the roof a little and do colored standing seam as opposed to a gray and the perspective drawings do address giving the standing seam with a more a rich dark burgundy red color. Carter Bean, project architect, showed a sample of the color.

Ms. Husak said they have worked with the applicant on innovative sign ideas and with the architecture and the surroundings they are looking at a plaque type sign design with the lighting suggested by the Commission that was approved for the Bridge Pointe shopping center. She said each tenant would be allowed to have two wall signs; one the Perimeter Drive elevation and one the interior elevation to the north, a blade sign would also be allowed on the north side. She said the wall signs have different options for the rounding and edges of the sign to do a bit more interesting so that they are not all uniform and the blade signs providing different options and allowing for a depiction of what the business might be on the blade signs if the use or tenant warranted.

Ms. Husak said they are recommending approval of the Preliminary Development Plan/Rezoning which represents the blue in the proposed development text that the applicant changed, which is the list of permitted uses, the patio and sign requirements which are different and unique to this Subarea. She said Planning also recommends approval of the Final Development Plan and all the details presented with the two conditions:

- 1) That the plans be revised to change the color of the standing seam metal roof from grey to a deep red and the metal awning color be changed to match the metal roof, subject to approval by Planning; and,
- 2) That the applicant provide the shared parking agreement with Champaign Bank with the building permit application.

Paul Ghidotti, Daimler Group, said they have shown what the Commission had hoped to see from the Informal. He said present is Carter Bean, the project architect and Andrew Gardner, Bird & Bull, site engineer. He said staff has done a wonderful job presenting the application and they have worked with them for the last three months and hopefully everyone is excited about what they are developing.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there was anyone from the general public that would like to speak to this application. [There were none.]

Ms. Kramb said that parking did not seem sufficient for unlimited restaurant space. Mr. Ghidotti said they could agree to a maximum square footage that is allocated to restaurants, but they struck out the limitation due to the Commission comments that they wanted to make sure they were able to attract the right restaurants.

Mr. Hardt said when they saw the informal there was a quantity of restaurant discussed and it was expressed to give flexibility. Mr. Ghidotti said the original text limited no more than 11,000 square feet of restaurant and it was modified and expressed not to have the patio square footage limit the ability to have more square footage, they designed conceptually two patios on each end, established the max square footage of the patios of 2,000 square feet and he does not think they get to 2,000 square feet and their experience is typically restaurant outdoor space and indoor space is not typically occupied at the same time. He did not think it was intentional to take out the maximum square footage and if there is a desire to put back in the 11,000 square foot, he has no problem doing that and it was not an intentional change by them.

Ms. Husak said staff's concern with the limitation of the square footage of restaurants is that any kind of place that would serve food or whether it was a ice cream or soda shop or something it would all be classified as a restaurant.

Mr. Hardt said during the informal he heard that this site was originally intended for up to two free standing restaurants and it was too big of a site for one and it did not work for two and they are looking to have two restaurants and fill the space in between with retail and the retail was the question because the text did not allow retail at this end of the development and he said there is a practical limit to how big any one restaurant is going to be, but he envisioned the stuff in the middle to be retail.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said this came from their discussion about the coffee shop and the ice cream shop and the pretzel shop and those can come in as conditional uses if that is the mix that works.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the best solution to head off a major parking issue is to use the conditional use mechanism to come back through when a Smoothie King wants to come in there and the Commission can look at the numbers. Ms. Kramb said if they put the 11,000 square feet back in, it could be any number of restaurants and if they wanted to go over the 11,000 they would have to come back and get approval for the smoothie shop.

Mr. Fishman said there are different types of restaurants that have dancing which causes a different type of traffic that would change the character of the whole area and is concerned if it is one huge 14,000 square foot restaurant. Ms. Amorose Groomes said if they have two restaurants of similar size 5,500 square foot restaurant is not a monster.

Mr. Fishman said he does not have a problem with two 5,500 square foot restaurants he is concerned if it becomes one large 11,000 square foot restaurant. Mr. Taylor said if there is a cap for the total amount of restaurant and a cap for one single restaurant. Mr. Ghidotti agreed that concept is fine, his preference is not to have to come back for a 1,200 square foot Smoothie King, that example of someone that size coming back for an amended final development plan and go through that process they will lose that tenant.

Mr. Hardt said they are okay with 11,000 square foot of total restaurant, but if they want to go over that they have to get approval. Mr. Ghidotti agreed.

Ms. Newell said she thought that was a good solution and the development is going to look very nice. Ms. Amorose Groomes said there are solutions that they can engage and they could talk through what might be most efficient for them depending upon who is coming.

Ms. Kramb suggested revising the outdoor furniture text to reflect what the Commission had previously approved. Ms. Readler said they will add the condition to modify the language to make consistent with what was used.

Ms. Kramb said the text regarding signs says the creativity with signage is encouraged, but, it is not because there is prescriptive language and the signs are going to look just like every other sign. She said her issue is with sign illumination, reading the text that says "wall signs shall be illuminated either by linear fluorescent track lighting fixture as depicted in table "D". She wondered what the "or" option is. Mr. Ghidotti said they are trying to get away from the goose necks, so they did and the architecture of the building is limited so they provided for track lighting that will not be seen.

Ms. Kramb said the second sentence is allowing signs to be internally illuminated or back lit. Mr. Ghidotti said the wall signs have to be lit and there are three options for lighting and wanted to allow internally illuminated or back lit signs.

Mr. Ghidotti said the wall signs have to be lit, but there will not be lighting on the blade signs or projecting signs.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see a solution and make sure that the option for a more creative sign to be proposed to the Commission. Mr. Ghidotti said they tried to incorporate the concept for the projecting signs face they could have the good or service.

Mr. Hardt said there is something in the text that refers to window signs and that no permanent windows signs are permitted, and in this general area they do not allow window signs at all. Ms. Husak said they do allow temporary window signs in the area and not specified in the text.

Mr. Hardt said he would like this text or code regarding window signs to match the existing retail center.

Mr. Hardt said the wrong code section is reference for color limitation allowing the logo to be counted as one color allowing three additional colors. Mr. Langworthy said the correct section is 158(C)(4) refers to color.

Mr. Hardt said every other retail center within a mile of this project they have not allowed internally or back lit signs and given this building was to fall into line with the other buildings in the area and is not comfortable with the two alternative lighting methods. Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed it is not an appropriate location for internally illuminated signs. Mr. Taylor agreed.

Mr. Budde said if they permitted this and this is the new Dublin and the new signage and new interests, why not and if the neighbors want to come and make some changes, that would be their prerogative and the Commission could help in creating this new look.

Mr. Hardt said the new look was for the Bridge Street Corridor. Mr. Budde said except for the City did not create the Nationwide Children's multi-color logo. Ms. Amorose Groomes said this is a more sign style issue. Mr. Hardt said it is an illumination style.

Ms. Newell said she agrees with Mr. Hardt and it should be kept consistent with what is in place with the surrounding businesses and is only fair. Mr. Fishman said he understood the "New Dublin" is strictly within the Bridge Street Corridor and they were concerned it would leak out of the corridor.

Mr. Taylor said a minor technicality with installation, signs are mounted flush to wall and where they are on the synthetic stone it would be better to stand off an inch. Mr. Ghidotti agreed.

Mr. Hardt said on the cut sheet submitted for the linear florescent tubes that the cold start ballast are an option and wanted to make sure they are used or they will flicker in the winter. Mr. Ghidotti agreed to order them as indicated.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said as discussed they will limit the restaurant space in the text 11,000 square feet and to exceed that would require Commission approval, some patio furniture out of season storage language to be incorporated. Ms. Husak said she added conditions:

- 3) That the development text be revised to limit the size of permitted restaurant use to 11,000 square feet excluding the outdoor dining patios and that any additional restaurant square footage, exclusive of outdoor dining areas, require review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission;
- 4) That the development text be modified to allow patio furniture be used when the weather permits outside of the permitted dates, subject to Planning approval;

She said she also summarized the sign discussion.

Mr. Ghidotti said they have to use the illuminated tube that is referenced in the shell of the first part of section 6. He said they were trying to get away from the goose neck lighting and wanted to give people more flexibility and it will look more uniform and different from the area and will look nice and wanted to give creativity and allow for it. He said lighting and signage were the two areas they struggled with to take their comments and come back with what they thought the commission wanted to hear.

Mr. Hardt said the scalloped sign panels, wood sign panels with goose neck lighting fixtures are getting tired and would like to see more creativity as general statement, but this site is the last puzzle piece of an already developed site, they should stay the course and finish this. Mr. Ghidotti said that is exactly what Ms. Husak had told them in the early discussions after September, while they want to be creative it is hard to make a lot of changes with everything around. He said it is an infill site.

Ms. Kramb said they wanted to make sure they get the logo option. Mr. Ghidotti said they wanted to refer to both paragraphs.

Ms. Kramb said she really disliked the barn doors on the elevation with the pedestrian glass door next to it and with the awnings over it and looks awkward.

Ms. Kramb said the finials on the center section she does not care for and they are usually crooked and look small and never look right when built and would like to nix them. Mr. Taylor said there is bad precedent in the area for leaning finials.

Mr. Taylor said on the site plan the new entrance coming in from the north there is a planting island and a one and a half parking space when someone pulls out of will be into the entrance and thought they should expand the landscape island to avoid an accident. Mr. Ghidotti said that is why the island was placed there to avoid potential problems, and agreed to switch that space to a van accessible handicap space to avoid any issues.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to see the return on the gables something other than little dog house returns and the trim style is simple and can be something other than the tucked under piece and the finials. Ms. Newell said she is not crazy about the finials, but since they are on the other buildings she felt they were appropriate.

Mr. Taylor said they always look good on drawings, but thought they should be replaced with something more appropriate gable return for the style of the building.

Ms. Newell said she is okay with the barn door detail because it is something newer and did not object to it. Mr. Taylor said he likes the barn door on the right. Ms. Kramb said it is the western side barn door and the other is a full door with a pedestrian door next to it.

Mr. Bean said they are working on another project where they are doing a similar treatment and instead of the man door being on the side it is in the middle to appear that the barn doors a slid open and this is the gap between. Ms. Kramb said that sounds better. Ms. Amorose Groomes thought it is a cool option.

Ms. Newell said she appreciated the sidewalks across the street frontage that connects and it was a response to her comment that it did not have much pedestrian access and appreciated the solution.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they have circled the entire property in sea green junipers and asked that they change the back side of the rear of the property and stop at the east and west entry points out with wintergem boxwood and appreciated that they have the plantings held back more than 5 feet off of the parking surface. Mr. Ghidotti said they had a different spec tree and staff suggested junipers as one of the options.

Ms. Newell said that boxwood is not a hardy plant for snow piled on them and wanted to know if that was a concern. Ms. Amorose Groomes said in the area that is in the back location because the push of snow would go in the different direction and far enough away from the drive lane to be clear of the salt spray.

Mr. Ghidotti said he is concerned with the location of the dumpster at the northwest corner and not sure if they should change the plant material north of the entry drives and if they could just change out the plantings at the north drive because of the screening is mirrored on both sides. Ms. Amorose Groomes agreed to make the change on the north property line.

Motion #1 and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to recommend approval to City Council for this Rezoning with Preliminary Development Plan application because it complies with the applicable review criteria and the existing and anticipated development standards, with four conditions:

- 1) That the development text be revised to limit the size of permitted restaurant use to 11,000 square feet (excluding outdoor dining patios) and that any additional restaurant square footage, exclusive of outdoor dining areas, require review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission;
- 2) That the development text be modified to allow patio furniture be used when the weather permits outside of the permitted dates, subject to approval by Planning;
- 3) That the development text be modified to limit sign lighting to the proposed band lighting; and
- 4) That the development text be revised to adhere to Code for sign colors including logos and that window signs be prohibited, excluding informational window signs.

Mr. Ghidotti agreed to the above conditions.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Motion #2 and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this Final Development Plan application because it complies with the applicable review criteria and the existing and anticipated development standards, with five conditions:

- 1) That the plans be revised to change the color of the standing seam metal roof from grey to a deep red and the metal awning color be changed to match the metal roof, subject to approval by Planning;
- 2) That the applicant provide the shared parking agreement with Champaign Bank with the building permit application;
- 3) That the elevations be revised to replace the gable returns with a more appropriate style;
- 4) That the site plan be revised to increase the size of the landscape island to one parking space to the west along the parking area to the north of the building; and
- 5) That the sea green junipers on the north side of the site be replaced with wintergem boxwood.

Mr. Ghidotti, agreed to the above conditions.

Ms. Newell seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she wanted to thank the applicant's team for taking seriously their comments at the informal review and were able to get both the rezoning/preliminary development plan and the final development plan done, so hopefully it is a net gain. Mr. Ghidotti thanked the commission for their time and effort and apologized for the sloppiness in the text and that is not how they operate and he accepted responsibility for them and said it will not happen next time.

4. Tartan Ridge, Section 5-1 12-080FDP/FP

9327 Burnett Lane Final Development Plan Final Plat

Ms. Amorose Groomes introduced this application to develop one single-family alley lot within Subarea D1 of the Tartan Ridge Planned Unit Development. She said the site is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Emmet Row Lane and Burnett Lane. She said this application will require two votes. She said the Commission is the final authority on the final development plan and City Council will have to approve the final plat. She swore in those intending to address the Commission on this case, including the applicant, Charles Driscoll.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said they do not need a presentation and asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to speak with respect to this application. [There were none.]

Final Development Plan - Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the Final Development Plan because it complies with all applicable review criteria and the existing development standards, with 2 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the hedge installation graphic to reflect alley accessed lots prior to scheduling the plat for City Council review; and
- 2) That any fence for Lot 182 be selected from an architecturally appropriate palette to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the final development plan approval for the remaining alley lots.

Mr. Hardt seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Final Plat – Motion and Vote

Mr. Taylor moved to recommend approval to City Council for this Final Plat application because it complies with all applicable review criteria and the existing development standards.

Mr. Fishman seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Budde, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Commission Roundtable

Mr. Taylor said he was concerned that when they have a preliminary and a final development plan of the same thing before them he preferred not to see that combination, but when he looked at the Perimeter project he realized this kind of project was appropriate because they had a good description of the project in the concept stage. Ms. Amorose Groomes said it was appropriate because they had a cooperative applicant.

Mr. Taylor said there wasn't much of a leap from the concept stage to the preliminary development plan, so he didn't have a problem with it and he wanted to reiterate whenever appropriate and possible they would prefer to see those as two different applications. Ms. Husak said that is not always in their control depending on the applicant.

Mr. Hardt said they have seen it in the past with new developments where the preliminary and rezoning and the final development all comes through and give them heartburn, but this case tonight was a modification to a preliminary plan that was previously approved and felt more digestible and was more appropriate.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she was asked a procedural question about how it is determined how the roll is called on a vote. Ms. Readler said the person who makes the motion is last. Ms. Rogers said it is randomly called from the list each time with the person who made the motion and the seconded person are last. Ms. Readler said the order of the roll call should always be different because they would never want someone to always know the order.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any other comments. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on January 3, 2013.